Case 1:05-cv-10141-RGS	Document 1	Filed 01/24/2005 Page 1 of # // 39
		AMOUNT \$
		SUMMONS ISSUED (
		LOCAL RULE 4.1
LIMITE	D STATES DISTRI	
EOD THE I	DISTRICT OF MAS	CT COURT WAIVER FORMSACHUSETTMCF ISSUED
FOR THE I	DISTRICT OF MAS	
		BY DPTY, CLK. F. E
TOTALCACITACO		DATE 1-24-65
JOHN GACHAGO,)	
71 / 02)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No.
VS.)	05-10141 RGG
)	Va IVI4 PCC
BRISTOL MYERS SQUIBB, and)	
AMERICAN EXPRESS,)	
)	
Defendants)	
)	I_{N}^{*}
		MAGISTRATE JUDGE Caufin

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that defendant Bristol-Myers Squibb Company ("BMS") hereby removes to this Court the state court action entitled <u>John Gachago v.</u>

<u>Bristol Myers Squibb et al.</u>, Civil Action No. 04CV2682, filed in Quincy District Court,

Norfolk County, on or about December 20, 2004. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1446(a), a copy of all process, pleadings, and orders received by BMS is being filed with this Notice at

Tab A. In support of removal, BMS states as follows:

GROUNDS FOR REMOVAL

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this removed action under 28 U.S.C. § 1441 because this action originally could have been filed in this Court under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332. More specifically, this Court has original jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because some or all of the claims alleged in the Complaint arise under the Constitution, Laws, or treatises of the United States. The Complaint requests relief under the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq. See Complaint at ¶ 12. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims are thus founded in and arise under the laws of the

United States. To the extent that any of the claims alleged in the Complaint do not relate to 15 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq., they fall within the principles of supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367, therefore making the removal of the entire case proper.

- 2. In addition, diversity jurisdiction exists under 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the plaintiff is a citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, defendant Bristol-Myers Squib Company is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business in New York, and the complaint alleges that defendant American Express is a New York corporation with a principal place of business in New York. The Plaintiff is seeking \$400,000 in damages. Therefore, the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. As a result, this Court has jurisdiction over this removed action under 28 U.S.C. § 1441.
- 3. As Defendant is filing this Notice of Removal within 30 days after December 23, 2004, the date on which CT Corporation System, registered agent of BMS. was served with Plaintiff's complaint, this Notice of Removal is timely filed under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).
- 4. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 101 because it is the "district and division embracing the place where such action is pending." See 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a).
- 5. American Express Travel Related Services, Inc. ("American Express"), improperly named in the Complaint as American Express, consents to removal of this action.
 - 6. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

7. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), a copy of this Notice of Removal is being served on Plaintiff and Defendant American Express and a copy is being filed with the Clerk of Quincy District Court, Norfolk County.

Respectfully submitted, BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY By its attorney,

Eve Slattery (BBO #634776) Dwyer & Collora, LLP 600 Atlantic Avenue Boston, MA 02210

(617) 371-1000

Dated: January 24, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 24th day of January, 2005, I caused copies of the foregoing Notice of Removal to be served by first-class U.S. mail, postage prepaid on:

John Gachago 21 Linden Park Drive Randolph, MA 02368

Joseph S. Sano Paige A. Scott Reed Prince Lobel Glovsky & Tye LLP 585 Commercial St. Boston, MA 02109

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

1

4

6

7

8

9

2 NORFOLK COUNTY

QUINCY DISTRICT COURT

3

CIVIL COURT

COMPLAINT FOR RELIEF

JOHN GACHAGO, 5

Case No:

04CV2682.

vs.

BRISTOL MYERS SQUIBB and

AMERICAN EXPRESS

GC SERVICES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

Defendant(s)

Plaintiff,

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1. The Plaintiff, JOHN GACHAGO is an individual currently residing in the state of Massachusetts with a usual place of domicile at 21 Linden Park Drive, Randolph, MA 02368 and formerly employed as a Territory Business Manager for Bristol Myers Squibb in the S E Massachusetts territory until May 3rd 2004.

2. The Defendants Bristol Myers Squibb (Tax ID#220790350) a corporation duly organized under the laws of the state of Delaware and American Express Company (Tax ID#134922250) organized under the laws of the state of New York and whose usual places of doing business respectively are 200 Vessey Street Zinew Work JUNN 110154 and 345 Park Ave, New York, NY 10154 and whose agental whoman the state of Massachusetts is CT I DENNIS BANK A DISTRICT CONSTRUCTION OF THE STATE OF T

COMPLAINT - 1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

CORPORATION SYSTEM located at 101 FEDERAL STREET BOSTON MA 02110. The defendants will hereafter be referred to as BMS and AMEX respectively.

- 3. On April 27^{th} 2004 the plaintiff filed a 4-week notice of resignation with his former employer Bristol Myers Squibb. Upon doing so he was asked by his manager at the time Joe Deluca to complete a final expense report and make arrangements to return all company material for a final close out by May $3^{\rm rd}$ 2004. Joe Deluca acting on behalf of Bristol Myers Squibb and his former manager of 3 months insisted that he close the plaintiff out on May $3^{\rm rd}$ 2004 well before the standard 2-week resignation typically permits. While standard close out procedures required Bristol Myers Squibb to collect all the company materials and company car from the resigning employees home, the plaintiff offered to leave his home in Massachusetts and deliver the company car and materials to Joe Deluca (Bristol Myers Squibb) at the Providence Marriott in Rhode Island for the final close out and completion of his responsibility to Bristol Myers Squibb. Joe Deluca as the manager for the Providence District and on behalf of Bristol Myers Squibb completed a checklist confirming that all company property had been returned and the plaintiff's services to Bristol Myers Squibb were complete making his resignation effective on May $3^{\rm rd}$ 2004.
- 4. On or around September 1st 2004 the plaintiff returned from a 3-week vacation to his current job only to find that there was a hold on his current American Express card provided by his current employer. The plaintiff also found a message on his answering machine from American

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Express calling about the balance on the plaintiffs BMS issued American Express corporate card.

5. The plaintiff then made multiple attempts to communicate with American Express on this matter explaining that this was not his personal account but rather Bristol Myers Squibb's corporate card and consequently there should be no hold on his current employer issued Amex corporate card if American Express had outstanding issues with the Bristol Myers Squibb issued American Express corporate card. After several exhaustive attempts and several days of being at a significant business disadvantage due to the hold on his currently issued AMEX corporate card he finally reached a Sandy at American Express in their collections department at telephone number 866 505 6811. Sandy on behalf of American express seemed to insist that this was the plaintiffs account and then proceeded further to explain something vague about the fact that it was a limited liability account and consequently was the plaintiffs responsibility. During this same conversation the plaintiff asked her to get in touch with Cathleen Everk who is the corporate card administrator who would in turn confirm this was a BMS account. She declined and insisted that this was the plaintiffs account even through it clearly read Bristol Myers Squibb and was paid for by Bristol Myers Squibb for the last 4 years. Sandy also said there was nothing she could do until BMS contacted Amex regarding this matter however she would not initiate the call. The plaintiff then decided the next best course of action was to

communicate with the Bristol Myers Squibb corporate card administrator Cathy Everk.

- 6. The plaintiff then communicated with Cathy Everk at Bristol Myers

 Squibb at telephone number 6094196584 and email cathy.everk@bms.com

 with a copy to Joe Deluca (BMS Providence Territory Manager) and Elaine

 Ferannaci (BMS Region Business Director) at the time. The plaintiff

 explained the situation asked that BMS communicate with American

 Express on this matter explaining that this was BMS account and not the plaintiff's account.
- 7. Between Aug 27th and September 10th several emails were exchanged with or copied to the plaintiff from BMS. On one of these emails dated

 September 3rd 2004 the plaintiff received communication from Cathy Everk at BMS that she had been in touch with Amex and let them know of the situation. In another of these emails Cathy Everk representing BMS as

 Corporate Card Administrator claimed that she could not have the charges paid without the managers (Joe Deluca) approval. In a separate email she copied the plaintiff on an email in which she clearly states that she could see that the plaintiffs final report was paid yet she further alledges there is a past due amount of \$1149.27. In the same email dated Augst 27th she asks Joe Deluca if he wants the plaintiff to reconcile the \$1149.27 and if so she can send him all his Amex statement. Shortly theraftre Cathy Everk (BMS) chose to mail the plaintiff statements that were 2 years old claiming the outstanding amount was the plaintiffs responsibility. In an attached note to the

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

statement Cathy Everk(BMS) demanded rather ludicrously that the plaintiff reconcile these statements for the last 2 years and provide what she alleges were missing receipts.

- 8. The plaintiff then called American express to confirm communication form BMS to them regarding this matter. At this point Amex confirmed that Cathy Everk on behalf of BMS had called and confirmed that BMS was going to pay off this account and because of this Amex agreed to remove the hold on the plaintiffs' Amex card issued by his current employer. At that point the plaintiff was led to believe that Amex resolved the matter he would no longer have to be concerned about it.
- 9. On or around November 25, 2004 as the plaintiff was seeking to refinance his home and purchase a new home he became aware of a derogatory report on his credit history suggesting that he was indebted to American Express to the tune of \$1219.00. For this specific reason the mortgage company denied him both the refinance and the new mortgage for the new home he and his family are relocating to. Other recent denials for credit as a result of this issue include that for office furniture and business equipment, not to mention the failure to obtain a lower interest rate.
- 10. The plaintiff then got in touch with the American Express Credit bureau unit in Ft Lauderdale, FL at 954 503 3787 or fax 954 503 7695 on 12/7/04 at 2.39 pm where he spoke with a Mrs Gordon. The latter confirmed that this outstanding amount of \$1219 was still showing on the plaintiffs

personal credit record as unpaid by him even though it clearly showed that it was a Bristol Myers Squibb Account. When the plaintiff asked how he could have this BMS account taken off their record as his personal account she suggested the plaintiff call BMS and ask that they call Amex. She also indicated that it was in collection by a company called GC Services. In her words if the plaintiff wanted any further detail on it such as the account number he would have to contact GC Services, which was the collection agency. Prior to this the plaintiff communicated in writing and via certified mail to GC Services asking they no longer call his home for a debt that they were fully aware was not the plaintiffs.

11. Due to this negligence and deceptive corporate irresponsibility on both the parts of BMS and AMEX the plaintiff has suffered as follows: His credit score and history has been substantially damaged resulting in denial of a mortgage to refinance his current home and the denial of a mortgage for the new home he and his family needed to begin construction on in December 2004 to occupy by June 2004. In addition due to this problem other credit providers have denied the plaintiff credit due to the mar on his credit report

12. Wherefore the plaintiff demands that the court award judgment in the amount of \$385,000 as commensurate with the lost ability to secure

a mortgage in the equivalent amount due to this erroneous report on the plaintiffs credit history, instruct the defendants to immediately withdraw in writing any and all derogatory credit as required by the Fair Credit Reporting Act. Further the plaintiff demands that under the authority of the court that the defendants write letters to every creditor that has requested a copy of the plaintiffs credit history in the preceding 12 months, cease and desist from having collections agencies such as GC Services from harassing the plaintiff for this alleged amount of \$1200.

- 13. Wherefore the plaintiff also asks that the court compel BMS to ensure that all Bristol Myers Squibb Territory Business Managers are made aware that the American Express Corporate Card issued by the same is the responsibility of the company and hold them harmless for any charges incurred for business purposes. Similarly when Territory Business Managers such as the plaintiff do obtain the American Express Card to conduct business on behalf of the defendant (BMS) that the employee's personal social security number be exempted form the card application completion process and instead require that the company's tax identification number solely be provided.
- 14. Wherefore the plaintiff also asks the court to compel American Express to release all employees of any liability when conducting business on their employers' behalf on an Amex corporate credit card issued in the employers name.

15. Wherefore the plaintiff charges that BMS deceptively compels its employees to accept the American Express Corporate card in such a manner that implies that it is a precondition for employment and further prevents employees from using the same for personal use but in fact hold the very same employees responsible for debt incurred on the company's behalf and while engaged in company business.

PLAINTIFF

By: John Gachago (Pro se)

21 Linden Park Drive, Randolph, MA 02368

Dated this 17th day of December, 2004

Sent via certified mail return receipt to Bristol Myers Squibb and American Express at CT Corporation System 101 Federal Street, Boston, MA 02110.

15. Wherefore the plaintiff charges that BMS deceptively compels its employees to accept the American Express Corporate card in such a manner that implies that it is a precondition for employment and further prevents employees from using the same for personal use but in fact hold the very same employees responsible for debt incurred on the company's behalf and while engaged in company business.

PLAINTIFF

By: John Gachago (Pro se)

21 Linden Park Drive, Randolph, MA 02368

Dated this 17th day of December, 2004

Sent via certified mail return receipt to Bristol Myers Squibb and American Express at CT Corporation System 101 Federal Street, Boston, MA 02110.

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES DATE FILED :To be 200	
St. 1996, c. 358, § 5	DOCKET NUMBER (To be reded by Clerk) Trial Court of
PLAINTIFF(S) - JOHN) GACHACO	DEFENDANT(S) Massachusetts
OI LINDEN STARK ARIVE	BRILTOL MIKEL - COMIAN
RUNDOLAY MH OX368	THE LAND EXPERSE
INSTRUCTIONS: THIS FORM MUST BE COMPLETED AND FILED THE COMPLAINT OR OTHER INITIAL PLEADING IN MIDDLESE.	WITH COUNTY: [Middlesex [] N. C.
TOTAL COUNTIES - SUPERIOR COURT, IN ALL CAME AND	TIONS: SUPERIOR COURT: Cambridge Lowell Co. "
DISTRICT COURT: IN ALL CIVIL ACTIONS SEEKING MONEY DAMA	IGES. DISTRICT COURT: Dedian
TORT CLAIMS	TNUOMA
A. Documented medical expenses to date:	
Total hospital expenses:	į.
2. Total doctor expenses:	
Total chiropractic expenses:	\$
4. Total physical therapy expanses	\$
4. Total physical therapy expenses: 5. Total other expenses (Pages/hal)	s
5. Total other expenses (Describe)	S
Documented lost wages and compensation to date:	SUBTOTAL: S
Documented property damages to date:	s
Reasonably anticipated future medical and hospital exp	S
. Reasonably lost wages:	s
Other documented items of damage (Occasion)	\$
Other documented items of damage (Describe):	S
Brief description of Plaintiff's initial to the	
. Brief description of Plaintiff's injury, including nature and	extent of injury (Describe):
r this form, disregard double or treble damage claims; indicate sin	ngle damages only. TOTAL: \$
CONTRACT CLAIMS	AMOUNT
vide a detailed description of claim(s):	OF MORTGAGE AND 5.35 C.000
REFINANCE : 6) DO	000, 82.2
BUSINELS OFFICE & ONIAMENT	REAT LINE FOR S_15,000
CONTINUE WITH CONSTANCTION	OF HOME IN FLORAL
his form, disregard double or treble damage claims; indicate sing	UAL.
	tle damages only. TOTAL: \$ 400,000
ORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF (OR PRO SE PLAINTIFF):	DEFENDANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS:
11/2/2/2/	5. I
Oave Oave	The state of the s
Type Name RROA	AMERICAN EXPRECS
LINAEN PARK DRIVE	MATHIZ MOTPLEGASON THITEM!
	TO TENERAL ST
testo an, agrana	BOSTON, MA GOLID

Catego	ory in whic	h the case belongs ba	sed upon t	the numbered nature of s	suit code l	isted	on the civi	l cover she	et. (See
local r	ule 40.1(a)	(1)).							
<u></u>	I.	160, 410, 470, R.23,	REGARDL	ESS OF NATURE OF SUI	IT.				
<u></u> .	II.			40, 550, 555, 625, 710, 7 *, 850, 890, 892-894, 895			-		or AO 121 or copyright ca
X	111.			210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370,					
: 1	IV.	220 422 423 430	460 510	530, 610, 620, 630, 640,	850 880				
		690, 810, 861-865,			, ,				
			, , -	•					
· <u></u>	V.	150, 152, 153.							
				f the first filed case in thi					
Hasa	prior actio	n between the same pa	arties and I	based on the same claim	ever bee	n filed	in this co	urt?	
_					YES		NO	X	
	he complai 3 §2403)	nt in this case questio	n the cons	titutionality of an act of o	congress	affectir	ng the pub	lic interest?	? (See
20 03(22403)							1, 7:	
		60	_		YES	L	NO	X	
it so, is	the U.S.A	. or an officer, agent o	r employee	of the U.S. a party?		******			
					YE\$		NO		
Is this	case requi	red to be heard and de	etermined I	by a district court of thre	e iudaes :	HIFEHT	nt to title '	28 HSC 822	847
		and de		., a mount ovail of tiffe					u →:
					YES	L)	NO		
Do <u>all</u> (Massa 40.1(d)	chusetts ('	es in this action, excli governmental agencie	uding gove es"), resid	ernmental agencies of the ing in Massachusetts re	e united s side in the	tates a	nd the Cor division?	mmonwealt '- (See Loc	h of cal Rule
					YES		NO		
	Α.	If yes, in which divis	sion do <u>all</u>	of the non-governmenta	l parties r	eside1	?		
		Eastern Division	X	Central Division			Western	Division	
	B.	If no, in which divisi agencies, residing		majority of the plaintiffs husetts reside?	or the onl	y parti	es, exclud	ing governi	mental
		Eastern Division		Central Division			Western	Division	7.000

				s pending in the state co ns)	urt requiri	ng the	attention	of this Cour	t? (If
		arate sheet identifying						25	
yes, su	bmit a sep	, ,			YES		NO	\sim	
yes, su	bmit a sep	arate sheet identifying Eve Slattery			YES		NO		

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained her in neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS John Gack (b) County of Partience	ago To		1	yers Squibb Com Express Company	- -
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff Norf	olk	County of Residence of	f First Listed Defendant	
	(CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		County of residence o	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES (ONLY)
OB.	J. Commission of the Commissio		1	O CONDEMNATION CASES, US NVOLVED.	SE THE LOCATION OF THE
	Address, and Telephone Number) Pro Se, 21 Linden P 02368	ark Drive,	Attorneys (If Known) See atta	chment.	
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box	Only) III. C	CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)
U.S. Government	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Part	y) Citiz	izen of This State	TF DEF 1	PTF DEF incipal Place
2 U.S. Government	4 Diversity	Citi	izen of Another State		
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parti	es in Item III)		of Business In A	Another State
IV. MATHOE OF CHIE			izen or Subject of a Greign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	06 06
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance			610 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act			620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability 🗇 365	Personal Injury -	of Property 21 USC 881	20 030 157	450 Commerce 460 Deportation
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment			630 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act			640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs.	☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability I	Liability 🖸	660 Occupational	☐ 840 Trademark	☐ 480 Consumer Credit
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)		ONAL PROPERTY Other Fraud	Safety/Health 690 Other		490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment		Truth in Lending	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	850 Securities/Commodities/
of Veteran's Benefits			710 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	Exchange
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract		Property Damage Property Damage	Act 720 Labor/Mgmt, Relations	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability		Product Liability	730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury		& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation			740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters
220 Foreclosure			791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant)	B94 Energy Allocation Act
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 443 Housing/ Habo	eas Corpus:	Security Act	☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	☐ 895 Freedom of Information
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability		General Death Penalty		26 USC 7609	Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination
290 All Other Real Property		Mandamus & Other			Under Equal Access
, ,	Employment	Civil Rights			to Justice
		Prison Condition			950 Constitutionality of
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights				State Statutes
Original 2 R	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from 3 Remand ate Court Appellat		instated or 5 Transf opened (specif	erred from 6 Multidistr	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute und	er which you are filing	Oo not cite jurisdictions	l statutes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of cause:	• •	•		
VII. REQUESTED IN	CHECK IF THIS IS A CL	ASS ACTION I	\$400\000	CHECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23		*400,000	JURY DEMAND:	☐ Yes ☐ No
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGI	NATURE OF ATTORNEY	Y OF RECORD		
1/24/05 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		Tutty	-		
	MOUNT AF	PPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUD)GE

2.	Category in which	ch the case belongs b	ased upon th	ne numbered nature of s	uit code list	ed on the civi	I cover sheet	t. (See
	local rule 40.1(a)		u				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	(600
1 1	I.	160, 410, 470, R.23	, REGARDLE	ESS OF NATURE OF SUI	т.			
	ANTONA P - E			40, 550, 555, 625, 710, 7 , 850, 890, 892-894, 895			olete AO 120 trademark o	or AO 121 r copyright case
m.P.	X III.		345, 350, 3	10, 230, 240, 245, 290, 3 55, 360, 362, 365, 370, 3				
2	Iv.	220, 422, 423, 430	, 460, 510, 5	30, 610, 620, 630, 640, 6	350, 660,			
	Swayac ya Ač	690, 810, 861-865,	870, 871, 87	75, 900.				
	<u></u>	150, 152, 153.						
3.				cal rule 40.1(g)). If more the first filed case in thi	-	or related ca	se has been 1	filed in
4.	Has a prior action	on between the same p	arties and b	pased on the same claim	ever been f	lled in this co	ourt?	
					YE\$	NO NO	X	
5.	Does the compla 28 USC §2403)	aint in this case questi	on the const	litutionality of an act of c	ongress affe	ecting the put	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	(See
	If so, is the U.S.A	A. or an officer, agent (or employee	of the U.S. a party?	YES	NO NO	X	
					YES	NO NO		
6.	Is this case requ	ilred to be heard and d	etermined b	y a district court of thre	e judges pur	suant to title	Selection and an artist of the selection and artist of the selection artist of the selection and artist of the selection artist of the selecti	4?
					YES	NO	X	
7.				rnmental agencies of the ing in Massachusetts re				
					YES	No.		
	Α.		Z	of the non-governmenta	l parties res	ide?		
		Eastern Division	X	Central Division	-	Western	Division	£
	В.	If no, in which divi- agencies, residing		majority of the plaintiffs husetts reside?	or the only p	arties, exclu	ting governm	iental
		Eastern Division		Central Division		Western	Division	
8.		of Removal - are there parate sheet identifyIn		s pending in the state co	urt requiring	the attention	of this Court	? (If
					YES	NO	\bowtie	
(PLEAS	E TYPE OR PRINT	Eve Slattery					,	
	NEY'S NAME	Diacetry						